DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 123 JC 750 429

AUTHOR Allan, Beverly
TITLE Two-Year/Four-Year College Articulation with Comments on State-Level Articulation Efforts in Virginia.
PUB DATE 29 Oct 74
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; Academic Standards; *Articulation (Program); Educational Mobility; Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Junior Colleges; *Statewide Planning; *Transfer Policy; Transfer Students
IDENTIFIERS *Virginia

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes that a sound articulation procedure is one which facilitates the student's progress toward the baccalaureate degree in the shortest possible time and in a manner conducive to proper academic standards. Transfer students face problems of admissions discrimination, inappropriate counseling, insufficient preparation, nontransferability of both academic and vocational courses, and lack of financial aid. When the two-year college tries to parallel the four-year institution's program too closely, it may lose students who would benefit from other methods or who must compensate for weak backgrounds. Based on a review of statewide articulation agreements in other states, the recommendations for Virginia are: (1) no associate degree student can be guaranteed entry into a particular program, but admission to some state senior college should be assured; (2) each senior institution should publish a list of equivalent lower division courses given at its major sending institutions; (3) these sending institutions should design their programs in cooperation with their receiving senior colleges; and (4) state senior institutions should not require any additional lower division work, provided the student does not change majors. This plan leaves each institution autonomy, while implying that a two-year transfer program must be accountable for the future success of its students. (Author/MJK)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED110123

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# TWO-YEAR/FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE ARTICULATION

with

# COMMENTS ON STATE-LEVEL ARTICULATION EFFORTS IN VIRGINIA

by

Beverly Allan
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
October 24, 1974

JC 750 429

Student unrest of the 1960's overshadowed an event which would have more impact on changing the character of higher education than any of the widely reported campus confrontations. The rapid growth of the community college during this decade was to significantly alter the long traditional system of higher education in America. In 1958, the number of students enrolled in two-year colleges was close to 375,000. In 1968, this figure had climbed to over 1,800,000. [4,1] By 1973, nearly thirty per cent of the students enrolled in institutions of higher education were in two-year colleges, or close to 3 million. [24,10] It has been estimated that by 1979 one in every 2.5 students enrolling for the first time in higher education will be in a community college. [10,44]

A vast majority of these students will be in transfer programs. At present, it is estimated that over two-thirds are in such programs. [24,18] It should be noted that in some states the figure is considerably less than this national average. In Virginia, for example, somewhere in the neighborhood of thirty per cent are enrolled in traditional transfer programs. A remark should be made about this, however. That is, the door has now been opened for those students in certain community college technical programs in Virginia to transfer to a state university offering a baccalaureate degree in technology.

With this changing scene in higher education comes monumental transfer problems. Many of the hurdles encountered by students wishing to transfer from a two-year college to a four-year institution cause considerable frustration. Originally,

these students are lured to the community colleges by policies of open access and accommodation; however, in many cases later attempts at transfer to upper division colleges are met with limited access. Transfer often means loss of credits, time, money, and even enthusiasm. In order for students to fully benefit from the educational opportunities extended by the combined system of two-year and four-year institutions articulation problems must be minimized.

Interest in transfer problems extends beyond that of the students to society in general. Professor James Wattenbarger of the University of Florida related to this matter when he stated:

> The continued concern evidenced in many places about the cost of education will make it even more necessary to eliminate articulation problems.... Smooth transfer from one [institution] to another will be essential in order to conserve the available resources for productive activities. The person who provides support will not be satisfied with failure rates and elimination procedures which have been common in the past, especially if such procedures can be eliminated through soundly developed articulation procedures. [33,168]

As much as the individuals may deny it, many of the debilitating issues in articulation are the result of the lack of understanding by faculty and administrators of the mission of either the sending or receiving school. Barriers to transfer resulting from sheer parochialism rather than honest efforts in developing creditable procedures continue to hamper the students' smooth transition.

This lack of understanding is especially true on the part of the four-year college faculty and administration. According to Dr. Leslie Malpass of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University:

> There is a ubiquitous lack of information among the four-year college faculty members, department heads, and college curriculum committees, about the nature, scope, and quality of two-year college curricula. This is compounded by a sometimes smug and patronizing attitude toward two-year colleges in general. [32,5]

On the other hand, two-year college faculty in some instances do not fully understand, or are not sympathetic to, the fact that not all four-year colleges and universities have the same mission and that some institutions that are especially restrictive or elitist should remain so. [19,36][32,5]

Many of the articulation problems resulting from such biases within academia can be eliminated by external, and in some instances self-serving, motivations. Examples of such motivations are:

1. situations of dwindling enrollments in four-year public and private institutions,
2. existence of mandates to public institutions to modify their transfer policies, and
3. attractiveness of two-year colleges dependent upon their success rate in transferring students to senior institutions. [7,14]

What are the Issues of Articulation?

So far there has been no attempt to identify articulation problems as they pertain to the transition from a two-year to a senior college other than to indicate that they cover any hurdles encountered in the process. This paper will be concerned primarily with only one specific difficulty arising out of such a transfer. But for purposes of perspective an effort will be made to identify the major issues eminating from the procedure. As a matter of fact, one of the biggest problems in this whole area is the actual recognition of sources of difficulty on any particular campus. In short, *a sound academic articulation procedure is one which*

*facilitates the student's progress from his first year in a community college through his last year and baccalaureate degree from a college or university in the shortest possible time and in a manner conducive to proper academic standards.*

Of course, admission to a senior institution is the primary step which a student from a two-year school must make. All other questions of articulation are moot if access to an upper division program is denied. In a number of states the associate degree granted by an accredited community college is sufficient evidence, together, in some instances, with a particular required grade point average, for admission to a state college or university. In his recent book Middleman in Higher Education, Frederick Kintzer has predicted a rapid increase in the acceptance of the associate degree for admission by four-year colleges and universities throughout the country to the point where it will be commonplace by the end of the decade. [13,161]

One of the most recent examples of this trend is in the state of Virginia. Here the Admission and Articulation Committee of the State Council of Higher Education on July 12, 1974, approved the following report from one of its sub-committees:

> The Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees from Virginia Community Colleges should be recognized by all senior institutions of higher education...and policies should be developed which reflect a commitment to provide Community College graduates who have earned either an Associate in Arts or Science degree the opportunity to pursue a baccalaureate degree program for which the student is qualified at one of Virginia's four-year colleges and universities in which space is available. [28]

It should be noted that this does not guarantee that a student in Virginia with an A.A. or A.S. degree will be accepted at a state university, but it establishes the groundwork for changing attitudes.

In discussing the admission of a two-year college student, who has completed a prescribed college transfer program, to a four-year institution, it is generally assumed that he will do so with advanced standing. In fact, the Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between Junior and Senior Colleges published by the Joint Committee of the Junior and Senior Colleges in 1966, made this specific recommendation. [11,9] Admission, however, to a senior institution "with junior class standing" in no way guarantees that the student will don the baccalaureate robe in two years. All too often this realization comes as a severe blow to the transfer student.

Junior class standing and degree requirements are quite different matters. Junior standing may mean very little to the student, or it may mean that an agreement has been reached between the sending and receiving institutions or between the student and the receiving institution that no additional general education courses are required.

Perhaps one of the major shortcomings identified in the granting of junior standing is the course placement in the senior institutions. This relates to the shifting of some lower division courses to upper division courses which were equivalent to the community colleges' courses. [5,2] The result is either the repeating of a course already taken or simply the delaying of that which could already have been taken.

Thus, as indicated, the admission process alone to a senior institution, even with junior standing, does not tell the whole story about articulation. Some additional pressing issues in articulation will be briefly described here.

The first task in facilitating a smooth transition should begin early in a student's community college experience. Counseling the student about curricular demands and differences in the four-year college to which he is transferring helps prepare the student for his future transfer. Also, the community college should assure that the student develops study habits and becomes accustomed to academic procedures in a manner comparable to the native students in the lower-division program in the school he will later be attending.

In short, an all out attempt should be made to prepare the student not only academically but psychologically and procedurally for events to come in the senior institution. Because of the open door policy in most community colleges there is of necessity much individual attention given to the student, which he must not expect to get in a senior institution. A gradual weaning and encouragement of independence must take place as he progresses through his two years to better prepare him for the educational tasks ahead.

Following this sort of preparation for transfer is the point at which the four-year school should take over, after transfer. Dr. Malpass, in addressing this issue at an articulation conference held at VPI & SU last year, said:

> The data about the academic performance of transfer students imply that the four-year schools ought to give special attention to transfer students. In fact, I wonder whether at the department level, i.e. where the interaction is, there is any effort made to give other than routine assistance to transfer students. Other than noting the transcript, it is entirely possible that many, if not most, department advisors pay scant attention to the special needs of this group. This deserves discussion, I believe, at this conference but even more, after we disband today, among the faculties of the four-year colleges. [32]

Again referring to the 1966 Guidelines of the Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges, a number of specific recommendations were made concerning the counseling of transfer students by the senior institutions, pointing out their special needs. [11,13-15]

These two issues, preparing students for transfer and assisting their adjustment after transfer, involve much more than the administrative problems of evaluation of academic credit, lack of standardized grading systems, credit by examination, and agreement on what constitutes general education requirements. The two areas of responsibility mentioned above for both the two- and four-year institutions bear heavily on their need to see that the adjustment to a new academic atmosphere does not impede the student's progress. There will be no attempt in this paper to discuss any procedures for the two-year college in preparing the student for transfer or the four-year college in assisting in his adjustment. It should be noted, however, that this is an issue in articulation which gets very little attention either in the literature or in actual practice.

Several specific articulation issues have now been identified. There are still other problems which require resolution. Colleges must consider the rather thorny question of transfer of vocational-technical courses for credit in institutions with non-vocational programs. Can some of these courses be identified as having enough academic elements to be classified as fitting into a non-vocational curriculum? [7,11][32] Presently elective credit within an established maximum is being given for such courses by several colleges and universities throughout the country. [12,37]

Of particular importance to the whole question of open

access and equal opportunity for higher education is the issue of financial aid. Such assistance may not follow the needy students to the new institution. In many four-year colleges and universities financial aid processes are set up primarily for incoming freshmen. Much of the aid money available may already be committed to native students. This is certainly another articulation problem which must be resolved to assure that the education of students from the two-year colleges is not terminated prior to the baccalaureate degree because of finances. [18,17][7,14-15][2,18]

Certainly one may make a much more exhaustive list of issues in articulation than has been presented here. The intent has not been to cover the spectrum but rather to point out the fact that there is much more to this two-year/four-year college transition than the mere admission of the community college student into an upper-division program; albeit, this in itself can be a major problem.

The Articulation Problem Relating to the Academic Major

There is one other barrier to satisfactory articulation which has purposely been left to last. It is singled out because it is the one to which most professional time is devoted and the one which continues to cause the most conflict between sending and receiving institutions, with the student in the middle. This issue pertains to the transfer of courses required for particular academic majors or programs.

If one were to take for fact the view of Dorothy Knoell and Charles McIntyre expressed in their recent book, Planning Colleges for the Community, he would believe that most of the academic

problems were being handled well in transfer programs. They rather categorically stated this:

> Transfer programs, while one of the most successful programs, should also be examined in light of students' actual needs. Considerable community college staff time is devoted each year to maintaining good articulation with baccalaureate institutions to which the largest numbers of their students transfer. Articulation agreements insure the acceptance of courses and credits gained by students completing community college programs. Lower division programs in important transfer majors are reviewed to insure that community college programs are indeed parallel to the programs offered by the transfer institutions. The results of the program reviews and articulation agreements appear as recommendations in community college catalogs. Students can then select both major and transfer institutions when they enter a community college, and if they follow the prescribed program for the particular institution, they are assured of full credit and no time loss in making up requirements when they transfer. [15,118-119]

The matter of prerequisites or lower-division requirements for a major has perhaps caused more frustration to the transfer student than any other aspect of articulation. This is primarily the result of the senior college insisting that the community college student match closely his work with that of the lower-division courses in the senior college. Knoell and McIntyre have ignored the fact that the current literature is replete with articles and portions of books devoted to this very problem with varied and sundry suggestions for its solution.

The agreements between sending and receiving institutions, referred to by Knoell and McIntyre, can be fruitful, but there are many problems related to this. Wattenbarger has observed that even where agreements are successfully worked out their stability is often lacking. Changes in personnel of the agreeing schools may invalidate an agreement. Precedents may not be honored. [33,156-157]

Also at issue in course transfer is the requirement that the community college courses in a transfer program be parallel to those in the senior institution, a situation accepted as valid by Knoell and McIntyre, as well as by a large number of persons associated with senior institutions. Its validity, however, has been challenged recently by many writers on the subject.

With senior colleges establishing such varied requirements for their majors, and the resultant difficulty in realizing such a match, many transfer students spend sometimes as much as five and six semesters in the upper division. Frequently the transfer student will spend much of his junior year taking lower-division courses which he either did not take in the community college or did take but was denied transfer credit. Both of these situations cause much student consternation.

Often the student has taken on faith the advice of community college counselors as to the appropriateness of his course of study for a particular major only to find that he must take additional lower-division work or must repeat parallel courses because the content was considered inadequate or inappropriate by the senior institution. The situation regarding credit for general education courses which parallel those of the senior institution is improving rapidly. The real problem which exists today concerns lower-division courses required for a particular major. Further compounding the situation is that in some cases transfer students may be required by certain departments to take competency tests covering parallel courses which they have taken in the community college. W. Todd Furniss, director of the Office of Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education appropriately

questioned "whether the rigidity of some institutions in insisting on duplicate courses within an academic program before transfer credit is granted is reasonable." [7,11]

In most instances senior colleges throughout the country have assumed the role of specifying what courses, and the content thereof, are appropriate for lower-division programs leading to an upper-division major. Medsker and Tillery, authors of Breaking the Access Barrier, expressed the concern that "transfer programs of numerous junior colleges are too closely modeled after those of state universities to fit the needs of many students with potential for advanced study but with educational deficiencies from high school." [21,58] They express the belief that now is the time for new accommodations between faculties of two- and four-year institutions.

It is reasonable to believe that a community college approach to course substance may very likely better prepare its particular students for an upper-level major than one designed by the senior institution. Kintzer observed that "pressure to conform to university course outlines hinders the community college in designing work appropriate to student needs and in experimenting with new curricula and teaching techniques. [13,26]

Certainly there is a need for mutual respect between the faculties of the two levels of institutions and increased understanding of their respective missions. Both bodies are professionals and should regard each other as such for the ultimate benefit of the student. It is evident, however, that the community college is the newcomer on the scene and as such must prove itself.

Kintzer has commented on this by pointing out that the success of transfer students in the senior institutions is the primary mover in the general acceptance of community college transfer programs by such institutions. [13,13] He has offered the advice that even though the "work in the two institutions need not and should not be parallel or imitative,...equal rigor is certainly advisable if the transfer student is to have a fair opportunity to compete in the upper division." [13,14] He further has emphasized that "few community colleges however have faced the obligation of providing equal opportunity of success." [13,14]

A number of articulation issues have been identified in the preceding paragraphs. A specific proposal for solution of the transfer problem which relates to the academic major will be offered in the last section of this paper. But first, a brief overview of current efforts at improving articulation will be given for purposes of setting the scene for such a plan.

Efforts at Articulation

Efforts at improving articulation may be classified as national, state, or local in scope. The federal government to date has not offered any appreciable assistance in this area. Occasional grant money is provided. Perhaps the best known HEW funded project was that undertaken by Leland Medsker and Dorothy Knoell in 1964. Out of their research came the publication Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two- and Four-Year Colleges: With Implications for Coordination and Articulation. [16]

A more recent effort was the Airlie House Conference, held

in Warrenton, Virginia, December 2-4, 1973. The conference members considered the issue: "How can the policies and practices in postsecondary education be modified to accommodate better the needs of students who, in increasing numbers, transfer from one institution to another?" The conference was funded jointly by the Association Transfer Group, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Exxon Foundation, and the Federal Interagency Committee on Education.

Some national professional organizations in subject matter areas have sponsored programs on articulation. For example, the Commission on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences (CUEBS) established the Panel on Biology in the Two-Year College. The Panel recommended:

> CUEBS should initiate and guide efforts to sponsor one or more conferences with the purpose of constructing appropriate models for effective on-going articulation between two- and four-year institutions. [9,40]

A model for articulation has resulted from two such conferences.

The Mathematical Association of America through its Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics published in 1969 A Transfer Curriculum in Mathematics for Two-Year Colleges. Financial support was provided by the National Science Foundation. To date the adoption of this curriculum by two-year colleges has not been widespread. [20]

Another example of a professional association effort at articulating two- and four-year college academic programs has been in the area of telecommunications. This, however, was a statewide effort in California. In 1970 the Joint Committee for Articulating Undergraduate Telecommunications was established under

the sponsorship of the Western Education Society for Telecommunications. The result has been:

> A loose-leaf notebook outlining the broadcast curriculum offerings and equipment and facilities of all two-year institutions in southern California has been prepared and sent to all broadcasting departments. It is hoped that this standardization of courses along with equipment lists will enable four-year colleges to eliminate some of the unnecessary transfer difficulties telecom students encounter. [8,308-309]

If one researched the efforts of professional organizations he would find that many of them are recognizing that articulation within a subject-matter area is a serious problem and one in which they can be of assistance, if as no more than an instigator of planning. These efforts have obviously been the result of inaction on the part of state planners and the institutions themselves to do very much in the area of articulation within academic programs.

State planning efforts for articulation may vary extensively from formal state-wide plans and legally mandated procedures between public two-year colleges and four-year institutions as in Florida, Texas, and Illinois to no state machinery for even voluntary agreement in a number of states. California established an articulation conference in the 1930's, and task forces in nearly every subject area have been established for some time with the result that articulation of programs is being fairly well handled even though community colleges have no general agreement with the State College System. By the end of 1972 only twenty states had specific articulation plans, either formal, mandated, or voluntary. [26,449] [22,42][13, 47 and 107]

Two recent books provide detailed data concerning the various state plans for articulation. These are State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States by William

Morsch and Frederick Kintzer's Middleman in Higher Education which in part is a handbook of articulation procedures in the fifty states and the District of Columbia.

Articulation in Florida is quite sophisticated. Florida was the first state to develop and implement a state-wide agreement on general education requirements. In 1965 the State Board of Education approved an articulation agreement guaranteeing junior college transfers acceptance as juniors by the state universities. In 1971 the state board approved a new plan which encompasses the 1965 agreement and set forth a number of new policies intended to facilitate transfer from the junior to senior institutions. [13,36]

The Florida Articulation Coordinating Committee, on which the university and community colleges are represented, resolves problems and coordinates practices relating to specific disciplines. [22,62] Although Florida would seem to have a well developed articulation procedure, a number of problems exist. One such problem is the defining of academic courses and the determination of which courses should be taught in community colleges and which in the university. [13,40]

In both California and Michigan the voluntary agreements approach prevails. The voluntary type of articulation relies extensively on regular and subject-matter liaison committees which may be temporary or permanent to recommend policies and procedures which the schools may agree to adopt. Procedures then are by agreement and not edict from a state board of higher education or some other state coordinating body. In Michigan, as Kintzer has pointed out, there is a spirit of cooperation among the two-year and four-year institutions. It is interesting that this is

in spite of the fact that authority for course transfer determination rests with the receiving institution. [13,102] Kintzer, however, alluded to some problems when he related that there is "increasing evidence that the future will bring greater control by state agencies," with certain limits imposed on the autonomy of the state colleges and universities. [13,106]

In the foregoing paragraphs a rather cursory survey of articulation attempts on a state-wide basis has been presented. In some states where no particular plans exist there are often bilateral agreements being made between institutions. It should be noted that even in a state such as California where there has been a long history of community colleges and where articulation has long been a state-wide concern, even though voluntary, there are still independent groups as mentioned earlier attempting to articulate within particular disciplines where situations have been somewhat less than desirable. This would indicate that transfer problems, especially as they pertain to entry into an academic program are still with us. The Airlie House Conference held in 1973 substantiates this.

Kintzer believes that the development of sound articulation procedures should be through voluntary agreements, that "the most effective articulation is invariably the result of a carefully developed partnership in education." [13,162] He however agrees with the statement made in Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between the Junior and Senior Colleges that "certain outside pressures for compulsory coordination may...arise unless voluntary agreements are reached and translated into appropriate action." [11,6] Mandated articulation enforced by a state agency is the

least acceptable solution as far as Kintzer is concerned. [13,124] To him articulation is both a process and an attitude and only through mutual respect can successful articulation plans be developed.

Attitudes, however, are slow to change. Robert Brooker of Southern Illinois University has addressed himself to this matter. To expect rapid progress in subject-matter articulation, he stated "would ignore the necessity to break down the artificial barriers established by the academicians." [5,248] Also, as pointed out earlier in the paper, voluntary agreements may exist only during the tenure of those personnel participating in their adoption.

A personal note perhaps is appropriate here. Kintzer described the Virginia plan for two-year/four-year college articulation as one which has significant potential. Having been involved in Virginia in an attempt to achieve acceptance of just one particular community college course in an academic program at a nearby receiving university, the author would like to note that it required a period of negotiations of over four months and then with the result that it was designed almost totally according to the university specifications. Hopefully this agreement will be binding for some time, but no real guarantee exists. Course by course articulation is a slow, demanding process for both the sending and receiving institutions at best. Some further comments on the Virginia plan are contained in the appendix to this paper.

A Proposed Plan for Articulation Between Two- and Four-Year Colleges

The following suggested plan is designed to assist students

in their transfer from a public two-year community college to a state college or university. The adoption of these recommendations would avoid the necessity for course and program agreements between sending and receiving institutions. The articulation procedures would be mandated rather than voluntary. The recommendations are constructed to assure that students who have completed a prescribed course in a community college with an associate degree would be able to begin upper-division courses in their major in a four-year state institution without taking additional lower-division courses. Such assurance is made provided that the student does not change his major from that designated by his associate degree. No such guarantee can be expected if the major is changed.

> Recommendation I: *It should not be assumed that a student with an associate degree from a public community college is guaranteed acceptance into a program at any particular school in the state, but he must be guaranteed such acceptance in a state senior college.*

This recommendation is based on the belief that a student's higher education should not be terminated at the end of two years because of inability to achieve admission to a state senior college. Students enrolled in two-year colleges should be recognized as being enrolled in the higher education system of the state. This recommendation also recognizes that the missions of all state schools are not the same and that space allocations are not the same at all schools. An articulation committee should be established under the state coordinating body for higher education (all but two states have such a body) which should adjudicate any admission problems that arise from this recommendation.

> Recommendation II: *The state coordinating body for higher education should mandate that all state four-year institutions publish a list of equivalent lower-division courses (or acceptable substitutes) by program and number, based on the course descriptions provided by at least those community colleges from which most of their transfer students are received.*

For states with state-wide community college systems and standardized course descriptions this task is simplified, of course. It should be noted that the design of the upper-division programs would be the autonomous responsibility of the receiving institution.

> Recommendation III: *Community colleges should design programs based on information contained in the above four-year institution publications. Supplementary to this, particular attention should be given to achieving the closest articulation with colleges receiving the majority of their students.*

The community colleges would have autonomy in designing their own programs which best fit the needs of their students both as to their characteristics and their future degree plans. Course equivalences should only be guidelines.

> Recommendation IV: *State four-year institutions receiving transfer students with an associate degree should require no additional lower-division work provided the student does not change his academic major from that designated by his associate degree.*

The consequences of these recommendations may be summarized as follows. They require no strict policies as to adherence to identical parallel courses on the lower-division level, thus eliminating a great number of articulation questions. Many writers in this area have expressed concern over the rigidity of four-year colleges demanding nearly exact parallel courses. The recommendations recognize that faculty and administrators of community colleges can best determine in the light of senior college

program requirements what are the most appropriate means of preparation for their students. The community colleges are given more freedom in course planning, but this is accompanied by an implied accountability for the future success of their students in the four-year institution. The autonomy of the senior institutions is preserved by prescribing their requirements for the upper-division major. It is apparent that this plan places more emphasis on program design, thus involving the faculties more than counselors and admissions officers in the transfer process.

The most important consequence is that the student benefits from these recommendations by not losing credit or time and hopefully receiving better preparation for his major in a particular state school. However, the plan does place responsibility on the student to assess his chances of success at any particular school based on information arising from the processes developed under the plan.

As Kintzer has said, articulation is both a process and an attitude. This plan offers a process, and it is believed that it would improve mutual respect between faculties of two- and four-year colleges through a new partnership relation with specific areas of autonomy.

# APPENDIX

## SOME COMMENTS ON STATE-LEVEL ARTICULATION EFFORTS IN VIRGINIA

In Virginia the State Council of Higher Education is responsible for developing and maintaining a coordinated system of higher education. [29] Through its Articulation Advisory Committee it has developed guidelines for promoting articulation between two-year colleges and four-year colleges and universities in Virginia. The guidelines as updated June 8, 1972, very clearly place the four-year institutions in the position of being able to call the shots as far as the transfer student is concerned. There is no mention of program area meetings between the two- and four-year colleges as a vehicle for improved articulation. The only suggestion in the guidelines for cooperation between these two bodies is that they should establish procedures to provide counselors and advisors with information pertinent to transfer. One would not expect guidelines to be procedural in the sense that specific details of articulation methods would be given; however, one might expect to find the guidelines for promoting articulation to be more profound, or useful, than the one which reads:

> The evaluation of transfer courses by four-year institutions should serve to inform the individual student at the time of admission how far he has advanced toward his degree objective and what residence and subject requirements must still be met. [29]

It is at this point that the transfer student receives his greatest disappointment if the evaluation process tells him that he has a lot of catching up to do. This guideline in no way can be construed as an aid to articulation. The student should long

before this time know what is expected of him at a number of senior colleges in the state.

Guideline II from the State Council is perhaps, under existing conditions in Virginia, the most useful to the transfer student. It states:

> Two-year college students should be encouraged to choose as early as possible the four-year institution and program into which they expect to transfer in order to plan programs which may include all lower-division requirements of the four-year institutions. [29]

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Airlie House Conference. College Transfer Recommendations. Conference held December 2-4, 1973, Warrenton, Virginia (offset copy of proceedings).

[2] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A Special Report on the Commission. The Open-Door Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

[3] Defoe, Jesse J. "Engineering Technology Education: An Articulation Challenge for Technical Institutes and Senior Institutions." Community College Review, (Winter, 1974), 17-23.

[4] ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Linking Research and Practice for Community Colleges, 1966-1973. Los Angeles: The Clearinghouse, 1973.

[5] "Fact Versus Fiction (Articulation - Two-Year/Four-Year Colleges)." College and University, XLVII, No. 4 (Summer, 1972), 241-248.

[6] Florida. Report for Florida's Public Community Colleges 1970-1971. (March, 1972)

[7] Furniss, W. Todd, and Martin, Marie Y. "Toward Solving Transfer Problem - 5 Issues." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIV, No. 5 (February, 1974), 10-15.

[8] Gross, Lynn S., and Baker, Dan F. "A Telecommunications Group Tackles Articulation Problems." Improving College and University Teaching, XX, No. 4 (Autumn, 1972) 308-309.

[9] Hertig, W. H., Jr. "A Model for Improving Articulation," Community and Junior College Journal, XLIII, No. 6 (March, 1973), 40-41.

[10] Higbee, J. Marvin. "Upper Division Colleges: An End to Transfer Hurdles." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIII, No. 6 (March, 1973) 44-46,48.

[11] Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges. Report of the Committee. Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between Junior and Senior Colleges, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

[12] Kintzer, Frederick C. "Focus on Transfer - A New Awareness." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIII, No. 6 (March, 1973) 37-38.

[13] Kintzer, Frederick C. Middleman in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

[14] Knoell, Dorothy M. "Focus on the Transfer Problem." Focus on Action. Edited by Seldon Menefee and Jack Orcutt. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

[15] Knoell, Dorothy, and McIntyre, Charles. Planning Colleges for the Community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

[16] Knoell, Dorothy M., and Medsker, Leland L. Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two- to Four-Year Colleges: With Implications for Coordination and Articulation. Berkeley, California: University of California, 1964.

[17] Knoell, Dorothy, M., and Medsker, Leland L. From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

[18] Kuhns, Eileen. "Organizing for Change." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIV, No. 5 (February, 1974), 16-17.

[19] Kuhns, Eileen. "A Resolution to End Transfer Hurdles." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIII, No. 5 (February, 1973), 36-38,41.

[20] Mathematical Association of America. Report of the Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics. A Transfer Curriculum in Mathematics for Two-Year Colleges. Berkeley, California: The Association, 1969.

[21] Medsker, Leland L., and Tillery, Dale. Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

[22] Morsch, William. State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

[23] O'Grady, James P., Jr. "Articulation for Higher Education in Business: Partnerships Needed." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIV, No. 5 (February, 1974), 38-40.

[24] "Opening Fall Enrollment, 1972 and 1973," The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 14, 1974.

[25] Pasqua, Tom. "A Regional Subject Matter Catalog: It Can Aid Transfer." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIV, No. 5 (February, 1974), 30-31.

[26] Sherer, Paul. "Junior-Senior College Articulation." College and University, XLVII, No. 4 (Summer, 1972), 442-452.

[27] Spurr, Stephen H. Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches. Report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

[28] State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, Admissions and Articulation Committee. A Sub-Committee Report on The Admission of Associate in Arts and Associate in Science Degree Holders to Senior Institutions (as amended), June 12, 1974 (typewritten).

[29] State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Guidelines For Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Virginia. Revised June 8, 1972 (offset).

[30] State Council of Higher Edcation for Virginia. The Virginia Plan for Higher Education. January, 1974.

[31] Virginia. Policies, Procedures, and Regulations: Virginia Community College System. (September 28, 1966).

[32] Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University. "Challenge of Articulation in Virginia." An invitational conference held April 26, 1973 (offset)

[33] Wattenbarger, James L. "Articulation with High Schools and Four-Year Colleges and Universities." Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Edited by Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 12 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION